

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,245	02/20/2004 .	Eric Jones	OSTEONICS 3.0-452	1363
530	7590 10/05/2006		EXAMINER	
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST			PHILOGENE, PEDRO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			
			DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	10/783,245	JONES, ERIC			
omee Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication and	Pedro Philogene	3733			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133)			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Fe	ebruary 2004.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,2,6-11 and 15-23 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 3-5 and 12-14 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original original access and the correction of the original original access and the correction of the original orig	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/20/04.8/33/04, 71/160	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2, 6-11,15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinemann et al. (5,456,723) in view of Cooper et al. (4,948,457).

Steinemann et al disclose a method for surface treating of a metal orthopedic prosthesis or prosthetic titanium implant comprising blasting at least the portion for implantation in bone, as set forth in column 5, lines after leaching out any grit on the stem surface with acid; as set forth in 4, lines 1-14; the bone contacting portion having a surface with an average surface roughness Sq of 5-10 um, the surface being substantially free of aluminum and silicon contamination when measure by an EDAX element analysis; as set forth in column 3, lines 1-35.

It is noted that Steinemann et al did not teach of chilled iron grit, as claimed by applicant. However, in a similar art, Cooper et al evidence the use of a chilled iron grit to prepare the surface of the metal component.

Therefore, given the teaching of Cooper, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use chilled iron grit to blast the surface of the implant.

As to the blasting with a G07 or G12 and the pressure of 6.5 bar and nozzle between 9 mm to 9.5mm and the blasting time or time between 3-4 minutes with a

Art Unit: 3733

stand –off distance between 10-15 mm; Cooper discloses, in column 2, lines 62, that conditions and duration of the grit blasting will have to discovered empirically since the optimum process parameters depend on the hardness and size of the grit and speed of the grit particles on impact against the metal component. Therefore, given the teaching of Cooper et al, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at these parameters; as claimed by applicant.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-5, 12-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6,069,295	5-2000	Leitao
3,725,016	4-1973	M.K.Mal et al
WO 96/16611	6-1996	Beaty

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pedro Philogene whose telephone number is (571) 272-4716. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on (571) 272 - 4719. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/783,245

Art Unit: 3733

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Pedro Philogene September 29, 2006